

Date: Wed, 5 May 93 16:41:47 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #128
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 5 May 93 Volume 93 : Issue 128

Today's Topics:

 Autopatch (2 msgs)
 Cellular capable scanners...Buy'em While you can! (3 msgs)
 MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS) (2 msgs)
 sick of it all

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 4 May 93 15:24:31 EST
From: sdd.hp.com!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!wariat.org!
nraven!raven@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Autopatch
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Hypothetical situation:

I stop at a fast-food restaurant on my way to a friend's house. I decide that
I'll be a nice guy and see if he'd like me to bring something for him, so I
call him on the autopatch, ask him what he wants and how much it costs, etc..

Would that be illegal due to the "not for business use" clause in the rule
book?

raven@nraven.wariat.org
Dan Roberts (N8XXW)

Raven's Nest Inn 216/468-3890

Date: Tue, 4 May 1993 21:52:47 GMT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!sdd.hp.com!cs.utexas.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!
darwin.sura.net!bogus.sura.net!udel!gvls1!rossi@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Autopatch
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <raven.02pd@nraven.wariat.org> raven@nraven.wariat.org (Dan Roberts) writes:

>Hypothetical situation:

>

> I stop at a fast-food restaurant on my way to a friend's house. I decide that
>I'll be a nice guy and see if he'd like me to bring something for him, so I
>call him on the autopatch, ask him what he wants and how much it costs, etc..

>

> Would that be illegal due to the "not for business use" clause in the rule
>book?

Why not just call him from the fast-food place? Most have pay phones
don't they?

=====
Pete Rossi - WA3NNA ross@VFL.Paramax.COM

Paramax Systems Corporation - a Unisys Company
Valley Forge Engineering Center - Paoli, Pennsylvania
=====

Date: 5 May 1993 02:40:28 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!bogus.sura.net!news-
feed-1.peachnet.edu!umn.edu!lynx.unm.edu!dns1.NMSU.Edu!weasel@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Cellular capable scanners...Buy'em While you can!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Dan Roberts (raven@nraven.wariat.org) wrote:
: ben@nj8j.atl.ga.us (Ben Coleman) writes:

: >> Does this mean that I can disable 7 channels of my 10 channel scanner
: >> and then use it to monitor the 'restricted frequencies'?

: >Of course not. The scanner is still capable of scanning 4 or more
: >frequencies, you just happen to not be using that capability.

: Ok then, what if you have a non programable radio wave reciever.. can that be
: used to listen?

: (ya got ME going now! =)

: raven@nraven.wariat.org
: Dan Roberts (N8XXW)

Raven's Nest Inn 216/468-3890

How about this: a cheap crystal-controlled scanner that only had 3 channels in it? Make 'em cheap enough to buy a lot of them. :) Or be able to fabricate an add-on board with enough space for x number of crystals that would plug into the forementioned scanner in a not-so-obvious way. It would be a cheap 3-channel scanner with electronics that 'enhance' it without actually being easy to modify. Hell, I don't know, ya got ME going now, too!

-T.J. Harrell III

P.S. you know how the new regs say that scanners can't contain circuitry to decode digital cellular signals? How about having a plug-in PC board decode the output of a scanner? Could this be done? These new regs are challenging, eh?

Date: 4 May 93 15:20:56 EST
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!wariat.org!nraven!
raven@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Cellular capable scanners...Buy'em While you can!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

ben@nj8j.atl.ga.us (Ben Coleman) writes:

>> Does this mean that I can disable 7 channels of my 10 channel scanner
>> and then use it to monitor the 'restricted frequencies'?

>Of course not. The scanner is still capable of scanning 4 or more
>frequencies, you just happen to not be using that capability.

Ok then, what if you have a non programable radio wave reciever.. can that be used to listen?

(ya got ME going now! =)

raven@nraven.wariat.org
Dan Roberts (N8XXW)

Raven's Nest Inn 216/468-3890

Date: Wed, 5 May 1993 02:22:16 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Cellular capable scanners...Buy'em While you can!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

raven@nraven.wariat.org (Dan Roberts) writes:

>Ok then, what if you have a non programable radio wave reciever.. can that be
>used to listen?

>

> (ya got ME going now! =)

You can't listen to cellular if that's what you were asking because that is illegal. It was illegal before this stupid additional legislation was passed. Can you use it to listen to non-cellular frequencies, absolutely. It doesn't *automatically* switch between 4 or more frequencies, right? Sounds like it passes to me.

It's this sort of stuff and antenna restrictions we ought to be putting our energies behind.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: 5 May 93 00:45:52 GMT
From: rtech!amdahl!grafex!ka6etb@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

> It is possible you missed the genesis of this thread. I was told by a MARS
> operator that designators are used *on amateur frequencies* to *conceal*
> the actual frequencies from non-MARS members.

Nope...I have been following for awhile.

The MARS op you talked with was in error. Most likely an honest error, but an error nonetheless.

> If you are saying "I'll meet you on 2P1" in an effort to obscure any meaning
> of the communication, that is contrary to 97.113(d). It is a matter of inten
> If you are not using the designator "2P1" to obscure meaning of the
> communication, you will be happy to explain what it means on the air. If

> you are not willing to explain what "2P1" means on the air because you don't
> want people to know what it means, then you *are* using a code.

If someone were to ask me about 2P1, I'd say it was a MARS frequency. I don't have to tell them what the frequency is, just as I don't have to tell anyone what the frequency is for any 2-mtr repeater. It may be rude, but it's a fact.

I think you are splitting hairs...and RCHs at that.

73 de steve

Date: Tue, 4 May 1993 20:19:50 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!cs.utexas.edu!wotan.compaq.com!twisto.eng.hou.compaq.com!
talgo.eng.hou.compaq.com!joseb@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <XD113B2w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>, robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

|> andrews@fmsysm.ncoast.org (Andrew Sargent N80FS) writes:
|>
|> > In article <V9qX3B2w165w@GRAFex.Cupertino.CA.US> ka6etb@GRAFex.Cupertino.CA.U
|> > >andrews@fmsysm.ncoast.org (Andrew Sargent N80FS) writes:
|> > >
|> > >> Let's cut to the chase here...
|> > >>
|> > >> Would somebody just post all the MARS frequencies. Let's get this
|> > >> out into the open, include the CAP frequencies too while your at it.
|> > >
|>
|> Civil Air Patrol frequencies can be found in their publication,
|> CAPM 100-1, which is available to anyone for a nominal fee from
|> National Headquarters, Civil Air Patrol, Maxwell AFB, Alabama 36112.
|>
|> Generally, they operate on several frequencies in the 4400-4700 KHz
|> range, on 26.620 MHz, and on 148.15 MHz. If any of these are in use
|> in your area, you will find the operations pseudo-military in nature,
|> of little value outside the organization, and most likely boring to
|> the average public safety monitor.
|>
|> Hope this helps.
|>
|> -Robert

I have heard activity on 148.375 here in Houston.

Jose
joseb@twisto.compaq.com

Date: 4 May 93 16:37:41 GMT
From: gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!usc!cs.utexas.edu!uwm.edu!linac!att!cbnews!jeffj@RUTGERS.EDU
Subject: sick of it all
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May3.231537.11520@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

>hlester@as.arizona.edu (Howard Lester) writes:

>

>I think it's been stated pretty clearly what's "wanted". Make the
>licensing requirements relevant and related to the privileges granted.
>Granting access to portions of the phone bands to someone because they can
>copy 20 WPM instead of 13 WPM or 13 WPM instead of 5 WPM seems a bit
>bizarre. In addition I think most have "wanted" the written exams
>substantially beefed up.

I have to agree with this. I have always thought the current licensing and testing structure to be somewhat bizarre. We should have 3 classes of license and one code test to adhere to International treaties. The written tests should be much more involved. I saw the English study manual and it is much harder than what we have here. However, once you study that and pass the tests. You will know radios and antennas inside and out! That's what we should have. If someone wants to ragchew and shoot skip, that's what CB is for, if someone wants to take a step up and get in a hobby that is technically widespread and involved, that is what Amateur Radio is for. When someone has to work his tail off to get something he usually takes it a lot more seriously and that is probably what has caused the Nocode debate to go on endlessly! CW is not easy to learn if you don't work at it. It is a MAJOR part of Amateur Radio no matter how much the anti-code guys would like it not to be. It shouldn't be a criteria for extra phone privileges but it has kept Amateur Radio from being like CB. 73!

Jeff

--

Jeff Jones AB6MB		OPPOSE THE NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT!
jeffj@seeker.mystic.com		Canada/USA Free Trade cost Canada 400,000 jobs.
Infolinc BBS 415-778-5929		Want to guess how many we'll lose to Mexico?

References <1993Apr30.045836.18412@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>,
<1993Apr30.110420.15482@VFL.Paramax.COM>,
<1993May5.004411.27545@alsys.com>u.washin
Subject : Cellular Phones

Yes, I have the Scanner BBS number.

[illegible]

References <C6DrBI.9u5@fmsystem.ncoast.org>, <V9qX3B2w165w@GRAFex.Cupertino.CA.US>,
<1993May04.145600.112514@locus.com>net
Subject : Re: MARS operators and coded messages

In article <1993May04.145600.112514@locus.com> dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

>>
>If you are saying "I'll meet you on 2P1" in an effort to obscure any meaning
>of the communication, that is contrary to 97.113(d). It is a matter of intent.
>If you are not using the designator "2P1" to obscure meaning of the
>communication, you will be happy to explain what it means on the air. If
>you are not willing to explain what "2P1" means on the air because you don't
>want people to know what it means, then you *are* using a code.
>
>How can it be simpler?

I think your assertion that one is somehow required to explain the meaning
of anything that is obscure to you is problematic. No-one is required to
explain ANYTHING to you other than their callsign, and that only after
every ten minutes and when terminating operations.

If I speak to someone about simulated annealing, it's not my fault if you
don't understand what I'm talking about. If I call a friend on the repeater
and say "let's switch to our 'secret' frequency" it doesn't matter that I
choose not to explicitly state the frequency EVEN if I did it because I
didn't want you to know what frequency we were going to.

In short, as long as I'm not using ciphers (codes to obscure plaintext)
then I'm not in violation. It doesn't matter if you understand the plaintext.
And, of course, you have no authority or right to expect anyone to explain
the meaning of their communications.

That's the way I see it, and the way I play it.

Simple.
--

These opinions may not be unique, and they may not express the views of U.Va.

```
-----  
| Jon Gefaell, Computer Systems Engineer \      /___ | SILENCE = DEATH  
| Security and Technology Planning R&D    \    /  / | Hate is *NOT*  
| I.T.C. Administrative Computing Services \  /  /  | a Family Value!  
| The University, UVA. Carruthers Hall    /\  /   | -----  
~~~~~\~~~~~ 73 de KD4CQY
```

Date: 4 May 93 21:02:13 GMT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!gatech!kd4nc!n4tii@decwrl.dec.com
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr30.220650.171705@locus.com>,
<1993May1.181744.14700@kd4nc.uucp>, <1993May03.154752.100382@locus.com>
Subject : Re: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)

dana@procyon.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

>In article <1993May1.181744.14700@kd4nc.uucp> n4tii@kd4nc.uucp (John Reed) writes:

>>

>>Oh come on, Dana....

>>

>Oh come on, John....

>>Let's change the scenario here...let's say I want my buddy to call me
>>on the phone at work.... I say "Call me at my work number." Since I didn't
>>exactly tell everyone what my work number is, or told people where I worked,
>>then I've just encrypted that transmission and I'm guilty....

>I wouldn't call this a code. If you had said "Call me at telephone
>number Roger-Fox-Dog", and then refused to disclose to anyone who asked
>what number "Roger-Fox-Dog" is, then you are using a code. Saying "Call
>me at work" may or may not be intentional encoding.

>>I don't care....let someone pink slip me ... If I'm down here talking to
>>my friend Eddie, who's Army MARS, and I tell him "Go to MARS PACKET" then
>>that is not a cipher...I don't have to tell him and the whole repeater where
>>I'm going....one, it's none of their business.... I CAN be secret if I
>>want to....you probably bitch and moan about the guy that uses the cover
>>tone on the autopatch...and then you only hear one side of the conversation.

>No, you cannot be secret if you want to. Part 97.113(d) sez so. However,
>saying "Go to MARS packet" is not a cipher, as long as you are willing to
>explain what MARS stands for. If you said "Go to MARS frequency
>Alpha-Delta", and you are not willing to reveal what the meaning of
>"MARS frequency Alpha-Delta" is (i.e. which frequency), then you have
>used a code.

>In my case, a MARS op said "We use designators on amateur radio to
>conceal the actual frequency". This is a clear case of concealing the
>meaning of a transmission, and the intent is clear.

> I'm frankly quite exasperated by the tone this thread has taken; I've
>been misquoted, flamed and insulted for what is really a very elementary
>observation. A person said "I use a code on ham radio to obscure
>meaning". What could be clearer?

Well, why didn't you just say so? (grin)

I'm with you...I'm also exhausted with this whole thing, too.

Basically, MARS ops will continue to use Designators, not Ciphers, to identify the freq in which they operate. Whether it is by choice, intentional or not. Saying that our net is on "Charlie Foxtrot" is basically the same thing as a police officer saying that they have dispatch on F-5 but talk-around is on Tac-1.

Many times, I don't even know the freq, but I know the designator. And when I am moved over to the freq, I've got to get out the big book.

I do think, however, that the MARS regulation which stems from DOK directives and rules, perhaps may have some precedence over part 97, or at least be an affirmative defense of an amateur that does so.

Enough already, if it's allright with you, I say we end the thread...and any further topics, you may consult with me via email.

73 and no hard feelings, OM

John Reed

N4TII - AFA2FH - Redstar 207
HAM AFMARS CAP

n4tii%kd4nc.uucp@gatech.edu

>--

> * Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are
*
> * (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily
*
> * dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
*
> * This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: 5 May 1993 02:39:12 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!bogus.sura.net!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!umn.edu!gaia.ucs.orst.edu!skyking.oce.orst.edu!stanley@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C6DrBI.9u5@fmsystem.ncoast.org>, <V9qX3B2w165w@GRAFex.Cupertino.CA.US>,
<1993May04.145600.112514@locus.com>du
Subject : Re: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)

In article <1993May04.145600.112514@locus.com> dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

>If you are saying "I'll meet you on 2P1" in an effort to obscure any meaning

>of the communication, that is contrary to 97.113(d).

If you are operating a MARS station you are not subject to part 97, you are subject to MARS rules. If those rules take you into the amateur frequencies, it doesn't matter. Government radio location services, when present in the amateur bands, are also not bound by part 97. Neither are the international broadcasters in zones II and III who transmit in the 40m band.

>How can it be simpler?

Yes, how can it?

Date: Wed, 5 May 1993 00:44:11 GMT
From: news.cerf.net!crash!telesoft!garym@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <strnlghtC69F6G.MKM@netcom.com>,
<1993Apr30.045836.18412@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>,
<1993Apr30.110420.15482@VFL.Paramax.COM>
Subject : Re: Cellular capable scanners...Buy'em While you can!

>In article <1993Apr30.045836.18412@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

> 3. As defined within our rules, scanning receivers, or "scanners,"
> are radio receivers that can automatically switch between four
> or more frequencies anywhere within the 30-960 MHz band. In...

Seems to me that under this definition, cellular telephones are scanners, since they automatically switch among more than 4 frequencies in this band. And I can't find any exemption in the new rule for them, how do they get certified?

--GaryM

--

Gary Morris KK6YB Internet: garym@alsys.com
San Diego, CA USA Phone: +1 619-457-2700 x128 (work)

Date: 4 May 93 15:32:49 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!cs.utexas.edu!usc!hacgate!dunes!tony@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C695qC.D3A@odin.corp.sgi.com>, <1993Apr29.225304.6651@kd4nc.uucp>,
<1993May02.012853.183124@locus.com>
Subject : Re: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)

This is code meant to obscure the meaning of a transmission:

og upi vsm trsf yjod, upi jsbr ntplrm yjr vpfr

this is a cypher ment to obscure meaning:

76 12910 528 9523 86710, 12910 62115 499758 865 5935

the following is ment to obscure the meaning:

Large man with a black coat talking into a small IC 2SAT-- "The woods are deep and cold" Listening on the radio a voice returns.. "I have miles to go before I sleep"

The above are examples of what a OO or FCC would consider out right codes and cyphers to obscure meaning.

To say: "I'll meet you on channel 6" or "Lets take this conversation to 5 Serria 4 Bravo net" or "We don't talk about freq on the air" if said over amateur bands; are not cypers, codes or obsucraty. Why? becuse of some very simple rules...

1) we, that is most of the U.S., speak english. The conversations above was in english. The meaning and purpose was easy to understand.

2) Because we speak a language that is common to us all. We have the ability to understand that which is not spoken. Example: "Lets take this conversation to 5 Serria 4 Bravo net". This can be easy to understand: A) the two hams involved know they are beginning to speak about subjects that have no place on amateur bands. They began to understand that, and as a listener I did too. B) The 5s4b net must be a NET! Gee that was obscure. To find out about that net, I'll grap my net directory (either ARRL's or on

e of many, many published ones you can buy) and look up 5s4b. Because the information is READLY open to have it is not obscure.

3) FCC rules do not over ride basic liberties. This was more or less used to explain why the FCC did not bust several repeaters in the L.A. area that use fowl and bad language. That is saying "We don't talk freq on the air" can be defened by the FCC ruling that what a local society allows to have run lose. Then they cannot decide fault. For those of you that wonder what I am talking about. A local repeater (that has had lots of publicty) was not shut down, even thought the FCC KNEW that bad language and ja

mming were present. This was due to a court case with the FCC that pointed out that when a society of people wish to express their freedom of speach, and the local communy does not abore it, then they have a right to continue. Don't flame

me, flame the justice dept.

In all, the simple conversation you had with the ham about MARS amounts to the same size of a null. That is nothing. The FCC or the OO service has better things to do than worry about such minor problems. To the poster that started this. Say this three times: "this is a hobby". Don't worry about your fellow ham. Others are out there that will worry. Trust me...

73 Tony AB6GA
NNNORFL Navy/Marine MARS
ARRL Monitoring station

Date: 5 May 93 19:01:46 GMT
From: ogicse!flop.ENG.RORST.EDU!gaia.ucs.orst.edu!skyking.oe.orst.edu!
stanley@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr29.225304.6651@kd4nc.uucp>,
<1993May02.012853.183124@locus.com>, <34031@hacgate.SCG.HAC.COM>
Subject : Re: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)

In article <34031@hacgate.SCG.HAC.COM> tony@dunes.NoSubdomain.NoDomain (Tony Reeves) writes:

>
>This is code meant to obscure the meaning of a transmission:
>
>og upi vsm trsf yjod, upi jsbr ntplrm yjr vpfr
>
>this is a cypher ment to obscure meaning:
>
>76 12910 528 9523 86710, 12910 62115 499758 865 5935

Actually, you have it backwards. Replacing each character of a plain language text by a different character is a cipher. Replacing a symbol or groups of symbols by a single symbol (either multicharacter or single character) is a code.

"The woods is dark and deep" is a code, when it is being used to convey information ala "Telefon".

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #128
